

Case Number:	CM15-0077113		
Date Assigned:	04/28/2015	Date of Injury:	01/14/1999
Decision Date:	05/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/22/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a 57-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 1/14/99. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back and lower extremities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post decompression and fusion, status post removal of hardware, status post revision of decompression and discectomy, intractable low back pain, degenerative disc and facet disease with stenosis, carpal tunnel syndrome and failed back syndrome. Treatments to date have included surgical intervention, spinal cord stimulator, activity modification, oral pain medication, and injections. Currently, the injured worker complains of lower back pain with radiation to the lower extremities. The plan of care was for home health care and a caudal epidural steroid injection.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

Home health care, 5 hours/day, 5 days/week: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home health services Page(s): 51.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines home health Page(s): 51.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on home health services states: Recommended only for otherwise recommended medical treatment for patients who are homebound, on a part-time or "intermittent" basis, generally up to no more than 35 hours per week. Medical treatment does not include homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom when this is the only care needed. (CMS, 2004) The request is for home health services due to the patient's inability to ambulate. The services requested for assistance are however, homemaker services and therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Caudal epidural steroid injection qty: 1.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural steroid injection Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on epidural steroid injections (ESI) states: Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The patient has the documentation of low back pain however there is no included imaging or nerve conduction studies in the clinical documentation provided for review that collaborates dermatomal radiculopathy for the requested level of ESI. Therefore, criteria have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.